



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,412	06/13/2006	Jae Keol Rhee	Q95351	6355
23373	7590	06/23/2008	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			MORRIS, PATRICIA L	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			1625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/596,412	RHEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patricia L. Morris	1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-17 and 21-50 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 18-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/13/06; 8/31/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 18-20 are under consideration in this application.

Claims 1-17 and 21-50 are held withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to nonelected subject matter 37 CFR 1.142(b). Claim 21 had been inadvertently included in Group VIII but it is not drawn to the claimed halogenation reaction. Any inconvenience to applicants is regretted.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group VIII in the reply filed on March 19, 2008 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen et al. (US 7,129,259).

Chen et al the instant iodination process. Note example 1, column 59, lines 33-54 of Chen et al., therein. Hence, the process is deemed to be anticipated therefrom.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Chen et al. Fukuda I (US 2005/0038092), II (US 2007/0185132) and Barbachyn et al. I (US 5,523,403), II (US 5,565,571).

Chen et al., Fukuda I, II and Barbachyn et al. I, II disclose the instant process. Chen et al. teach an iodination reaction using N-iodosuccinimide. Note scheme 1, lines 35-45, in column 57. Fukuda I, II and Barbachyn et al. I, II teach halogenation using iodine monochloride in acetic acid or acetic acid/ trifluoroacetic acid or with iodine and silver trifluoroacetate or with iodine and silver trifluoroacetate or the compound can be brominated using N-bromosuccinimide. Note column 10, lines 39-49 in column 10 or preparation 18 or last reaction in columns 29-30 of Barbachyn et al. II or reference example 49 of Fukuda I or reference example 22 of Fukuda II. The prior art processes of Fukuda et al. II and Barbachyn et al. I, II differ only in the starting material. However, Chen et al. recites that the instant alcohol of formula (II) may be used. As here, a phenyl ring is halogenated in the same position by a

bromine or iodine halogenating agent. The reaction of a specific phenyl compound with a halogenating agent does not render the process step itself patentable, anew; In re Albertson, 141 USPQ 730, which was specifically reaffirmed on the last page of In re Kuehl, 177 USPQ 250.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the process of the prior art with the expectation of obtaining the desired product, because he would have expected the analogous starting materials to react similarly. It has been held that application of an old process to a new and analogous material to obtain a result consistent with the teachings of the art would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Morris whose telephone number is (571) 272-0688. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

Application/Control Number: 10/596,412
Art Unit: 1625

Page 5

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Patricia L. Morris/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

plm
June 19, 2008